



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,012	11/29/2001	Paul D. Storfer	19985.0002	2700

23517 7590 03/21/2005

SWIDLER BERLIN LLP
3000 K STREET, NW
BOX 1P
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

DATE MAILED: 03/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/996,012

Applicant(s)

STORFER ET AL.

Examiner

Doug Hutton

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-273 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 35-91, 126-182 and 217-273 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-34, 92-125 and 183-216 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01072004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I (Claims 1-34, 92-125 and 183-216) in the reply filed on 6 January 2005 is acknowledged.

Claims 35-91, 126-182 and 217-273 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 6 January 2005.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- Applicant should add a period at the end of the sentence on Page 2, Line 4;
- the reference number "202A-302N" on Page 15, Lines 10 and 11 should be amended to – 202A-202N – because that is the proper reference number (see Figure 2).

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-16, 18, 19, 21-23, 25, 26, 28-30, 32, 33, 92-94, 96, 97, 99-107, 109, 110, 112-114, 116, 117, 119-121, 123, 124, 183-185, 187, 188, 190-198, 200, 201, 203-205, 207, 208, 210-212, 214 and 215 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Drexler, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0046248 A1.

Claim 1:

Drexler discloses a data collection process (see Figure 1; see Page 1, Paragraph 0002 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system collects data from an email message and imports it into a database), comprising the steps of:

- building a data entry form for entering requested data (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0026 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises email programs that allow a user to attach a file or a program to an email message and send it to a message recipient; the data importing system also comprises a second software application with a graphical user interface

(GUI) to receive information from the message recipient; this GUI constitutes a "data entry form for entering data");

- generating an email message including the data entry form (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0026 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system allows the user to generate an email message having an attached GUI);
- transmitting the email message (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0026 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system allows the user to send the email message);
- receiving an email message including the requested data (see Page 2, Paragraph 0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises a database import utility program that receives the email message that includes the GUI); and
- posting the received requested data to a database (see Page 2, Paragraph 0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises the database import utility program that associates and saves certain data from the email message to appropriate records, tables or fields in the database).

Claim 2:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 1, wherein the data entry form provides interactive entry of data into the data entry form (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system

comprises the GUI to receive information from the message recipient; the data importing system also comprises the MICROSOFT OUTLOOK® email utility, which allows the user to attach a spreadsheet (MICROSOFT EXCEL®), a database entry form (MICROSOFT SERVER® and MICROSOFT ACCESS®) and other interactive GUIs to an email message for delivery to the message recipient).

Claim 3:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 2, wherein the data entry form is created using at least one of a standard or proprietary document language, a script language, or a programming language (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises the GUI to receive information from the user; the GUI is created using a “standard or proprietary document language” in that the source code of the GUI is proprietary to MICROSOFT®).

Claim 5:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 1, wherein the data entry form provides interactive entry of data into the data entry form in a data entry system while the data entry system is not communicatively connected (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system allows the message recipient to receive the email message having the attached GUI, while the message recipient’s client computer is connected to the Internet; the message recipient

may subsequently disconnect from the Internet, load the GUI and interactively enter data into the GUI).

Claim 6:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 5, wherein the data entry form is created using at least one of a standard or proprietary document language, a script language, or a programming language (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises the GUI to receive information from the user; the GUI is created using a “standard or proprietary document language” in that the source code of the GUI is proprietary to MICROSOFT®).

Claim 8:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

- creating a dataset defining data that is to be collected (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0027-0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises a database program that allows the user to create the database that “defines” the data to be collected); and
- selecting a participant in the data collection process see Page 2, Paragraphs 0027-0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system

comprises email utilities that allow the user to address the email messages to selected individuals).

Claim 9:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 8, wherein the step of building a data entry form comprises the step of:

- building a data entry form for entering requested data defined by the dataset for the participant in the data collection process (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises the GUI to receive information from the message recipient; the user constructs the GUI and associates it with the corresponding database before attaching the GUI to the email message and sending it).

Claim 10:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 8, wherein the step of selecting a participant in the data collection process comprises the step of:

- selecting a plurality of participants in the data collection process (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0027 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises email utilities that allow the user to address the email messages to selected individuals).

Claim 11:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 10, wherein the step of building a data entry form comprises the step of:

- building a data entry form for entering requested data defined by the dataset for each participant in the data collection process (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises the GUIs to receive information from the message recipients; the user constructs the GUIs and associate them with the corresponding databases before attaching the GUIs to the email messages and sending them).

Claim 12:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 11, wherein the step of generating an email message including the data entry form comprises the step of:

- generating an email message including the data entry form for the each participant in the data collection process (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises the GUIs to receive information from the message recipients; the user constructs the GUIs and associates them with the corresponding databases before attaching the GUIs to the email messages and sending them).

Claim 13:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 12, wherein the step of transmitting the email message comprises the step of:

- transmitting a data entry form to each participant in the data collection process (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0026 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system allows the user to send the email messages having the attached GUIs).

Claim 14:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 13, wherein the step of receiving an email message including the requested data comprises the step of:

- receiving an email message including the requested data for each participant in the data collection process (see Page 2, Paragraph 0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises a database import utility program that receives the email messages that include the GUIs).

Claim 15:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 14, wherein the data entry form provides interactive entry of data into the data entry form (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises the GUI to receive information from the message recipient; the data importing system also comprises the MICROSOFT OUTLOOK® email utility, which

allows the user to attach a spreadsheet (MICROSOFT EXCEL®), a database entry form (MICROSOFT SERVER® and MICROSOFT ACCESS®) and other interactive GUIs to an email message for delivery to the message recipient).

Claim 16:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 15, wherein the data entry form is created using at least one of a standard or proprietary document language, a script language, or a programming language (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises the GUI to receive information from the user; the GUI is created using a “standard or proprietary document language” in that the source code of the GUI is proprietary to MICROSOFT®).

Claim 18:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 14, wherein the data entry form provides interactive entry of data into the data entry form in a data entry system while the data entry system is not communicatively connected (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system allows the message recipient to receive the email message having the attached GUI, while the message recipient’s client computer is connected to the Internet; the message recipient may subsequently disconnect from the Internet, load the GUI and interactively enter data into the GUI).

Claim 19:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 18, wherein the data entry form is created using at least one of a standard or proprietary document language, a script language, or a programming language (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises the GUI to receive information from the user; the GUI is created using a “standard or proprietary document language” in that the source code of the GUI is proprietary to MICROSOFT®).

Claim 21:

Drexler discloses a data collection process in a data entry system (see Figure 1; see Page 1, Paragraph 0002 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system collects data from an email message and imports it into a database), comprising the steps of:

- receiving an email message including a data entry form requesting data (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0026 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises email programs that allow a user to attach a file or a program to an email message and send it to a message recipient; the data importing system also comprises a second software application with a graphical user interface (GUI) to receive information from the message recipient; this GUI constitutes a “data entry form;” Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system allows the message recipient to received the email message);

Art Unit: 2179

- extracting the data entry form from the email message (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises the GUI to receive information from the message recipient; the data importing system also comprises the MICROSOFT OUTLOOK® email utility, which allows the user to attach a spreadsheet (MICROSOFT EXCEL®), a database entry form (MICROSOFT SERVER® and MICROSOFT ACCESS®) and other interactive GUIs to an email message for delivery to the message recipient; upon receiving the email message, the message recipient interactively opens the GUI and enters the requested information);
- interactively entering the requested data into the data entry form (as stated in the above discussion, Drexler discloses this limitation in that the message recipient interactively enters the requested information into the GUI); and
- transmitting an email message including the entered data (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises email utilities that allow the message recipient to send an email comprising the requested information to the corresponding database).

Claim 22:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 21, further comprising the step of:

- displaying the data entry form (as indicated in the above discussion, the message recipient interactively opens the GUI and enters the requested information).

Claim 23:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 22, wherein the data entry form is created using at least one of a standard or proprietary document language, a script language, or a programming language (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises the GUI to receive information from the user; the GUI is created using a “standard or proprietary document language” in that the source code of the GUI is proprietary to MICROSOFT®).

Claim 25:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 21, further comprising the step of:

- displaying the data entry form using a browser program (see Page 2, Paragraph 0025 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises Netscape Messenger, which operates via a browser).

Claim 26:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 25, wherein the data entry form is created using at least one of a standard or proprietary document language, a script language, or a programming language (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises the GUI to receive information from the user; the GUI is created using a “standard or proprietary document language” in that the source code of the GUI is proprietary to MICROSOFT®).

Claim 28:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 21, wherein the step of interactively entering the requested data into the data entry form comprises the step of: interactively entering the requested data into the data entry form while the data entry system is not communicatively connected (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system allows the message recipient to receive the email message having the attached GUI, while the message recipient's client computer is connected to the Internet; the message recipient may subsequently disconnect from the Internet, load the GUI and interactively enter data into the GUI).

Art Unit: 2179

Claim 29:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 28, further comprising the step of:

- displaying the data entry form using a browser program (see Page 2, Paragraph 0025 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises Netscape Messenger, which operates via a browser).

Claim 30:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 29, wherein the data entry form is created using at least one of a standard or proprietary document language, a script language, or a programming language (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises the GUI to receive information from the user; the GUI is created using a “standard or proprietary document language” in that the source code of the GUI is proprietary to MICROSOFT®).

Claim 32:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 28, further comprising the step of:

- displaying the data entry form using a browser program (see Page 2, Paragraph 0025 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises Netscape Messenger, which operates via a browser).

Claim 33:

Drexler discloses the data collection process of Claim 32, wherein the data entry form is created using at least one of a standard or proprietary document language, a script language, or a programming language (see Page 2, Paragraphs 0025-0028 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises the GUI to receive information from the user; the GUI is created using a “standard or proprietary document language” in that the source code of the GUI is proprietary to MICROSOFT®).

Claims 92-94, 96, 97, 99-107, 109, 110, 112-114, 116, 117, 119-121, 123 and 124:

Drexler discloses a data entry system for implementing a data collection process (see Figure 1; see Page 1, Paragraph 0002 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system collects data from an email message and imports it into a database), comprising:

- a processor operable to execute computer program instructions (see Figure 1; see Page 2, Paragraphs 0021-0025 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises an email utility interacting with a database via a computer network; thus, the data importing system ***inherently*** comprises a “processor” that executes “program instructions”);
- a memory operable to store computer program instructions executable by the processor (see Figure 1; see Page 2, Paragraphs 0021-0025 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system comprises algorithms involving

the email utility interacting with the database via the computer network; thus, the data importing system *inherently* comprises a “memory” that stores “program instructions” executed by the processor); and

- computer program instructions stored in the memory (as indicated in the above discussion, Drexler discloses algorithms to execute the steps performed by the data importing system) and executable to perform the steps of:
 - the limitations recited in Claims 92-94, 96, 97, 99-107, 109, 110, 112-114, 116, 117, 119-121, 123 and 124 (as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-16, 18, 19, 21-23, 25, 26, 28-30, 32 and 33, respectively, Drexler discloses these limitations).

Claims 183-185, 187, 188, 190-198, 200, 201, 203-205, 207, 208, 210-212, 214 and 215:

Drexler discloses a computer program for implementing a data collection process (see Figure 1; see Page 1, Paragraph 0002; see Page 2, Paragraphs 0021-0025 – Drexler discloses this limitation in that the data importing system operates via computer programs on a computer network to collect data from an email message and import it into a database), comprising:

- a computer readable medium (see Figure 1; see Page 2, Paragraphs 0021-0025 – Drexler discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure and text);
- computer program instructions, recorded on the computer readable medium, executable by a processor (see Figure 1; see Page 2, Paragraphs 0021-0025 –

Drexler discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure and text),
for performing the steps of:

- o the limitations recited in Claims 183-185, 187, 188, 190-198, 200, 201, 203-205, 207, 208, 210-212, 214 and 215 (as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-16, 18, 19, 21-23, 25, 26, 28-30, 32 and 33, respectively, Drexler discloses these limitations).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 7, 17, 20, 24, 27, 31, 34, 95, 98, 108, 111, 115, 118, 122, 125, 186, 189, 199, 202, 206, 209, 213 and 216 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drexler, in view of Narurkar et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,339,795.

Claim 4:

As indicated in the above rejection, Drexler discloses every limitation of Claim 2.

Drexler fails to expressly disclose a data entry form that is created using at least one of hypertext markup language, extensible markup language, Java, or Javascript.

Narurkar teaches a data collection process (see Column 3, Lines 49-61 – Narurkar teaches this limitation in that the data exchange system transfers data from a source data host to a destination data host), comprising:

- a data entry form that is created using at least one of hypertext markup language, extensible markup language, Java, or Javascript (see Column 9, Line 65 through Column 10, Line 13 – Narurkar teaches this limitation in that the data exchange system comprises a common gateway interface (CGI) that were commonly written in the Perl, Java, C and Visual Basic programming languages; such CGIs were commonly used to process the data of a form),

for the purpose of passing data between a web server and a corresponding web application (see Column 9, Line 65 through Column 10, Line 13).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Drexler, to include:

- a data entry form that is created using at least one of hypertext markup language, extensible markup language, Java, or Javascript,

for the purpose of passing data between a web server and a corresponding web application, as taught in Narurkar.

Claims 7, 17 and 20:

As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 4, Drexler, in view of Narurkar, discloses/teaches:

- a data collection process, wherein the data entry form is created using at one of hypertext markup language, extensible markup language, Java, or Javascript.

Claim 24:

As indicated in the above rejection, Drexler discloses every limitation of Claim 22.

Drexler fails to expressly disclose a data entry form that is created using at least one of hypertext markup language, extensible markup language, Java, or Javascript.

Narurkar teaches a data collection process (see Column 3, Lines 49-61 – Narurkar teaches this limitation in that the data exchange system transfers data from a source data host to a destination data host), comprising:

- a data entry form that is created using at least one of hypertext markup language, extensible markup language, Java, or Javascript (see Column 9, Line 65 through Column 10, Line 13 – Narurkar teaches this limitation in that the data exchange system comprises a common gateway interface (CGI) that were commonly written in the Perl, Java, C and Visual Basic programming languages; such CGIs were commonly used to process the data of a form),

for the purpose of passing data between a web server and a corresponding web application (see Column 9, Line 65 through Column 10, Line 13).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Drexler, to include:

- a data entry form that is created using at least one of hypertext markup language, extensible markup language, Java, or Javascript,

for the purpose of passing data between a web server and a corresponding web application, as taught in Narurkar.

Claims 27, 31 and 34:

As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 24, Drexler, in view of Narurkar, discloses/teaches:

- a data collection process, wherein the data entry form is created using at one of hypertext markup language, extensible markup language, Java, or Javascript.

Claims 95, 98, 108, 111, 115, 118, 122 and 125:

As indicated in the above rejections, Drexler discloses every limitation of Claims 93, 97, 107, 109, 113, 116, 120 and 123.

Drexler fails to expressly disclose a data entry form that is created using at least one of hypertext markup language, extensible markup language, Java, or Javascript, as recited in Claims 95, 98, 108, 111, 115, 118, 122 and 125.

Narurkar teaches a data collection process (see Column 3, Lines 49-61 – Narurkar teaches this limitation in that the data exchange system transfers data from a source data host to a destination data host), comprising:

- a data entry form that is created using at least one of hypertext markup language, extensible markup language, Java, or Javascript (see Column 9, Line 65 through Column 10, Line 13 – Narurkar teaches this limitation in that the data exchange system comprises a common gateway interface (CGI) that were

commonly written in the Perl, Java, C and Visual Basic programming languages; such CGIs were commonly used to process the data of a form), for the purpose of passing data between a web server and a corresponding web application (see Column 9, Line 65 through Column 10, Line 13).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system, disclosed in Drexler, to include:

- a data entry form that is created using at least one of hypertext markup language, extensible markup language, Java, or Javascript, for the purpose of passing data between a web server and a corresponding web application, as taught in Narurkar.

Claims 186, 189, 199, 202, 206, 209, 213 and 216:

As indicated in the above rejections, Drexler discloses every limitation of Claims 184, 188, 198, 200, 204, 207, 211 and 214.

Drexler fails to expressly disclose a data entry form that is created using at least one of hypertext markup language, extensible markup language, Java, or Javascript, as recited in Claims 186, 189, 199, 202, 206, 209, 213 and 216.

Narurkar teaches a data collection process (see Column 3, Lines 49-61 – Narurkar teaches this limitation in that the data exchange system transfers data from a source data host to a destination data host), comprising:

- a data entry form that is created using at least one of hypertext markup language, extensible markup language, Java, or Javascript (see Column 9, Line

65 through Column 10, Line 13 – Narurkar teaches this limitation in that the data exchange system comprises a common gateway interface (CGI) that were commonly written in the Perl, Java, C and Visual Basic programming languages; such CGIs were commonly used to process the data of a form), for the purpose of passing data between a web server and a corresponding web application (see Column 9, Line 65 through Column 10, Line 13).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer program, disclosed in Drexler, to include:

- a data entry form that is created using at least one of hypertext markup language, extensible markup language, Java, or Javascript, for the purpose of passing data between a web server and a corresponding web application, as taught in Narurkar.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Spencer et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,349,299; Burfield et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,363,362; Kloba et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,779,042; Immerman et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,574,617; and Jennings, **Special Edition Using Microsoft Access 2000**, Chapter 7 – "*Linking, Importing, and Exporting Tables*" (Que Publishing, 5 May 1999).


Art Unit: 2179

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is (571) 272-4137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

WDH
March 15, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Hutton', with a stylized, sweeping flourish at the end.

**DOUG HUTTON
PATENT EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100**